



UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
Patent and Trademark Office

Address: COMMISSIONER OF PATENTS AND TRADEMARKS
Washington, D.C. 20231

NC

APPLICATION NO. 08/848,947	FILING DATE 04/21/97	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR LIU	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO. 38454-21
-------------------------------	-------------------------	-----------------------------	---------------------------------

STEVEN E SHAPIRO
MITCHELL SILBERBERG & KNUPP
11377 WEST OLYMPIC BOULEVARD
LOS ANGELES CA 90064

MM12/0816

LEAD	EXAMINER
------	----------

ART UNIT 2816	PAPER NUMBER
------------------	--------------

DATE MAILED: 08/16/99

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Commissioner of Patents and Trademarks

BEST AVAILABLE COPY



**UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF
COMMERCE**

**Patent and Trademark Office
ASSISTANT SECRETARY AND
COMMISSIONER OF PATENTS AND
TRADEMARKS**

Washington, D.C. 20231

**BEFORE THE BOARD OF PATENT APPEALS
AND INTERFERENCES**

Paper No. 14

Application Number: 08/840,947

Filing Date: April 21, 1997

Appellant(s): Edward W. Liu

MAILED
AUG 16 1999
GROUP 2800

Joseph G. Swan

For Appellant

EXAMINER'S ANSWER

This is in response to appellants' brief on appeal filed 6/28/1999

Art Unit: 2816

(1) *Real Party in Interest*

A statement identifying the real party in interest is contained in the brief.

(2) *Related Appeals and Interferences*

A statement identifying the related appeals and interferences which will directly affect or be directly affected by or have a bearing on the decision in the pending appeal is contained in the brief.

(3) *Status of Claims*

The statement of the status of the claims contained in the brief is correct.

(4) *Status of Amendments After Final*

The appellant's statement of the status of amendments after final rejection contained in the brief is correct.

Art Unit: 2816

(5) *Summary of Invention*

The summary of invention contained in the brief is correct.

(6) *Issues*

The appellant's statement of the issues in the brief is correct.

(7) *Grouping of Claims*

Appellant's brief includes a statement that claims 1-18 and 20-29 do not stand or fall together and provides reasons as set forth in 37 CFR 1.192(c)(7) and (c)(8).

(8) *Claims Appealed*

The copy of the appealed claims contained in the Appendix to the brief is correct.

(9) *Prior Art of Record*

The following is a listing of the prior art of record relied upon in the rejection of claims under appeal.

Art Unit: 2816

5,546,458

Iwami

August 13, 1996

(10) *New Prior Art*

No new prior art has been applied in this examiner's answer.

(11) *Grounds of Rejection*

The following ground(s) of rejection are applicable to the appealed claims:

Claim Rejections - 35 U.S.C. § 102

The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless --

(b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

Claims 1-2, 4-7, 9-16, 20-22 and 24-29 remain rejected under 35 USC 102 (b) as being anticipated by Iwami (US Pat. 5,546,458).

With regard to claim 1, the Iwami reference discloses in Figures 1-2 and 4 a noise canceller circuit comprising:

Art Unit: 2816

- a first circuit (38, 38a, 38b).
- a second circuit (40, 40a, 40b).
- a subtractor or a third circuit (36).
- a digital circuit (16) or other digital circuit within the wireless telephone set (11) located proximately to the first circuit and the second circuit (Figure 1).
- a plurality of analog circuits (54, 56, 58, 60, Figure 4), noise separator circuits (62, 64) and a noise canceling circuit (66).

Claim Rejections - 35 U.S.C. § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claims 3, 8, 17-18 and 23 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103 (a) as being unpatentable over Iwami (US Pat. 5,546,458).

Iwami discloses in Figures 1-2 a noise canceller circuit with all of the limitations of the present invention but does not disclose that the subtractor circuit comprises a halving circuit for reducing a signal by one-half of its magnitude as called for in claim 3. However, employing a subtractor comprising a halving circuit for further reducing an output signal is notoriously well known in the art (as disclosed on lines 22-25

Art Unit: 2816

of page 6 of the specification of the present invention). Thus, employing a subtractor having a halving circuit for reducing a signal by one-half of its magnitude in the Iwami circuit is considered to be a design expedient for an engineer dependent upon a particular environment and the application in which the noise canceller of Iwami is to be used. A skilled artisan would be motivated to employ the subtractor having a halving circuit in the Iwami circuit for the purpose of further reducing the magnitude of the output signal. Also, employing a digital subtractor comprising an adder for subtracting two signals is notoriously well known in the art.

(12) *New Ground of Rejection*

This examiner's answer does not contain any new ground of rejection.

(13) *Response to argument*

The appellant argues that the second amplifier (40) of Iwami as shown in Figure 2 is not located proximal to the first amplifier (38) (see page 12, lines 10-11); and the amplifiers (38, 40) have output noise components, resulting from noise experienced by the circuits, that are approximately equal (see page 12, lines 1-9). The arguments have been carefully considered but are not persuasive because Figure 2 of the Iwami reference shows that the second amplifier (40) is near the first amplifier (38) within the box (32) and column 5, lines 21-26, discloses that all of the amplifiers within the box 50 in Figure 4 are the same type of amplifier. Also, the existence of the subtractor (36) which combines the outputs of the amplifiers (38, 40) for performing the noise canceling function would clearly indicate that the amplifiers (38, 40) should have identical structure. Since the structure of the amplifiers (38, 40) are identical and they are

Art Unit: 2816

proximately located, the amplifiers (38, 40) would experience the same interference noise or electromagnetic environment noise generated within the system and internal noise generated by components of the amplifiers.

The appellant argues at page 13, lines 1-9 of the appeal brief that the control section (16) of Iwami is not a digital circuit and is not located on the same integrated chip. This argument is also not persuasive because the control section (16) and the noise canceller (44) in Figure 3 of Iwami are arranged in the same box (44) so that they are inherently constructed in the same integrated circuit or in the same circuit board. Also, column 1, lines 14-15 of the Iwami reference discloses that the circuit of Iwami is used in the wireless telephone set which is available in digital technology, e.g., a cellular phone. Therefore, the control circuit of Iwami is inherently a digital circuit.

The appellant argues at page 13, lines 17-24 of the appeal brief that Iwami does not show that the noise components resulting from electromagnetic environment noise experienced by these input amplifiers are approximately equal. The argument is not persuasive. Since the noise contributed to the amplifier comprises internal noise generated by the components of the amplifier and the electromagnetic environment noise generated by other components within the system, and since the first amplifier (38) of Iwami is near the second amplifier (40), both transistors would experience the same magnitude electromagnetic environment noise.

The appellant argues at page 18, lines 16-24 of the appeal brief that Iwami does not show a plurality of analog circuits, a noise separator circuit and a noise canceling circuit. The argument is not persuasive because the recited "plurality of analog circuits", "noise separator circuit" and "noise

Art Unit: 2816

canceling circuit” are anticipated, respectively, by the “amplifiers (54, 56, 58, 60)”, the “amplifier (62, 64)” and the “amplifier (66)” as shown in Figure 4 of the Iwami reference.

The appellant argues at page 22, lines 6-11 of the appeal brief that there is no motivation for employing the subtractor having a halving circuit in the Iwami circuit for further reducing the magnitude of the output signal. This argument has been carefully considered but is also not persuasive because the examiner recognizes that obviousness is established by combining or modifying the teachings of the prior art to produce the claimed invention where there is some teaching, suggestion, or motivation to do so found either in the references themselves or in the knowledge generally available to one of ordinary skill in the art. See *In re Fine*, 837 F.2d 1071, 5 USPQ2d 1596 (Fed. Cir. 1988) and *In re Jones*, 958 F.2d 347, 21 USPQ2d 1941 (Fed. Cir. 1992). In this case, the Iwami reference discloses in Figure 2 a noise canceller circuit comprising the subtractor (36) for subtracting the output of the first amplifier (38) from the output of the second amplifier (40) but does not disclose that the subtractor (36) comprises a halving circuit for further reducing the output signal to one-half. Further the appellant’s admitted prior art suggests at page 6, lines 22-25, using a subtractor including a halving circuit for further reducing the signal to one-half. Thus, employing a subtractor including a halving circuit suggested by the admitted prior art in the circuit of Iwami for the purpose of further reducing the output signal to one-half would have been obvious to a person having ordinary skill in the art.

14) Conclusion

Serial Number: 08/840,947

Page 9

Art Unit: 2816

For the above reasons, it is believed that the rejections should be sustained.

Respectfully submitted,

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read 'Dinh Le', with a stylized, cursive script.

DINH LE
Primary Examiner
Art Unit: 2816

August 10, 1999